DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 021 783 24 SP 001 515

By- Mial, Dorothy

SPECIAL PROJECT TO TRAIN ACTION RESEARCHERS AND TRAINERS OF ACTION RESEARCH COLLABORATORS. FINAL REPORT.

National Training Labs. Inst. for Applied Behavioral Science, Washington, D.C.
Spons Agency- Fund for the Advancement of Education, New York, N.Y.; Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Bureau of Research.
Bureau No- BR-6-2283
Pub Date Aug 67
Grant- OEG-2-6-062283
Note- 30p.
EDRS Price MF- $0.25 HC- $1.28
Descriptors- *ACTION RESEARCH, *ADMINISTRATIVE PERSONNEL, *CHANGE AGENTS, *EDUCATIONAL CHANGE, FIELD EXPERIENCE PROGRAMS, INSERVICE EDUCATION, INSTRUCTIONAL DESIGN, *LABORATORY TRAINING, MANAGEMENT EDUCATION, T GROUPS
Identifiers- National Training Laboratories, NTL

A gap exists between new knowledge in education and change in practice; it calls for trained personnel to link the activities of school staffs and social scientists. Thus the objective of this special project is to improve methods of training change agents to improve classroom and school management practices. The 1966 programs involved 2 groups: (1) 22 university-based education interns with behavioral science backgrounds, and (2) 21 school system-based training consultants with in-service training responsibilities. Phase I of the action research program was an intensive 5-week residential core experience at Bethel, Maine. Phase II involved the equivalent of 3 weeks of field work on individual projects supervised by 12 members of the National Training Laboratories Network of social scientists. Phase III was a 1-week follow-up for evaluation and further training. Major strengths of the program included the mix of training with practice, the development of an extended training design, and the emphasis on self-direction by the interns in designing their own learning activities. In 1967, with little outside support, 50 new trainees, some of them teams or task forces from the same systems, were recruited. Greater emphasis was placed on trainee-trainer roles moving from staff direction through collaboration to full self-direction. The document includes a statistical report, organizational memoranda, application forms, and a list of the interns and consultants. (JS)

BR-6-2283
PA-24

FINAL REPORT

Grant No. OE G 2-6-062283

SPECIAL PROJECT TO TRAIN ACTION RESEARCHERS AND TRAINERS OF ACTION RESEARCH COLLABORATORS

August, 1967

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Office of Education
Bureau of Research

SP001515
ED021783

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

SPECIAL PROJECT TO TRAIN ACTION RESEARCHERS
and
TRAINERS OF ACTION RESEARCH COLLABORATORS

GRANT No. OE-G 2-6-062283

Dorothy Mial
Program Director

Instructional Dates of Program:
July 3-August 6, 1966
Three weeks during School Year
May 1-5, 1967

The training program reported herein was conducted pursuant to a grant from the Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Grantees undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgment of the conduct of the project. Points of view or opinions stated do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

NATIONAL TRAINING LABORATORIES OF THE NEA
(Recently incorporated as NTL INSTITUTE FOR APPLIED BEHAVIORAL SCIENCE)

Washington, D. C.

SP001515

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION	2
Statement of Problems	
Size of Trainee Group and Dates	
Objectives	
Multiple Level Training Objectives	3
DESCRIPTION OF THE PROGRAM	3
Core Experience	4
Phases I, II and III	5,6
EVALUATION	6
Objectives	7
Content	
Staff - ratio, assignments, etc.	8
Trainees - Selection Criteria, etc.	
Organization, Timing, Length, Schedule, etc.	9
Budget	
MAJOR STRENGTHS OR UNIQUE FEATURES	9
MAJOR WEAKNESSES OR DIFFICULTIES	9
OVERALL EVALUATION	10
RECOMMENDATIONS TO USOE	11
PROGRAM REPORT	11
Publicity	
Application Summary	
Trainee Summary	
Program Director's Attendance	12
Financial Summary	
A P P E N D I C E S:	
B. Memorandum to Education Interns on 1967 Plans, June 12, 1967	14
C. Memorandum to Staff on Training Consultant Program Planning, March 30, 1967	
D. Application Forms	
E. Rosters of Education Interns and Training Consultants	

INTRODUCTION

Statement of Problem

A number of conditions prompted this project. Pervasive change in education creates demands for effectiveness in new roles. To sustain effectiveness demands a continuing process of reassessment and retraining. Typically, however, the focus in educational planning is on innovations to be introduced with relatively little focus on the need for knowledge, skills, strategies, and processes related to change in education. New programs are launched and new functions created with inadequate attention to diagnosing the actual need for change, analyzing the system's state with regard to change, assessing consequences of alternative approaches, gathering data throughout the process of change, systematically evaluating results, and training for these various change functions.

At the same time, a growing body of knowledge and theory about individual learning and about organizational change is emerging out of a variety of contexts -- medicine, public health, industry, agriculture -- which could be adapted in educational improvement programs. For a number of reasons (see Miles, M. Innovation in Education), the lag between new knowledge and change in practice is especially great in education.

The lag is costly today when problems are urgent and when new federal and other funds make it possible to mount more adequate programs for improvement. There is an upsurge of innovativeness with funds available for research, for planning, for training, yet we lack trained diagnosticians, procedural technicians, researchers; we have not formed adequate linkages between school staff and social scientists; we have not adequately documented efforts made; we have advocated change without creating within systems inservice training programs designed around new role demands; we have carried on a variety of programs without adequately evaluating them.

Size of Trainee Group and Dates

The group included 22 university-based education interns and 21 school-based change agents or skills trainers. Added funds from the Ford Foundation enabled us to increase the original number of 20. The program included a residential program at the NTL facilities in Bethel, Maine (July 3-August 6), the equivalent of three weeks supervised field work over the school year, and a one-week followup training program in Washington, May 1-5, 1967.

Objectives

Our objective has been -- and continues to be -- improved designs for training of internal and external change agents as a key to

improving classroom and school management practices. The basic concern is how knowledge and innovations can be introduced, managed, and evaluated in ways to contribute to planned change.

Multiple Level Training Objectives

Since funds from the Bureau of Research were augmented by an additional grant from the Fund for the Advancement of Education of the Ford Foundation, we were able not only to double the number of trainees but, perhaps more important, to focus on two designs: one for the Education Interns and one for what we described as Training Consultants. The purpose of the Intern Program is to train persons from settings such as universities, state offices of education, regional educational laboratories, or professional associations as trainers who can bring the special resources of their settings to aid in meeting the professional growth needs of school systems required to stimulate and manage change. In addition, they are available to aid the Training Consultant in designing and evaluating his training activities and to supplement his training skills when needed by providing specialized growth opportunities in intrapersonal, interpersonal, and organizational dynamics.

The purpose of the Training Consultant Program is to train persons primarily in school systems as trainers who can help other members of their system increase skills in working with people -- skills in getting and using information in objective decision making, in problem solving, in taking action, in evaluating, and in discovering and using resources available from outside the system.

DESCRIPTION OF THE PROGRAM

The subject matter concerns the theory and techniques for improving educational practices -- classes that provide good learning experiences and systems that support these classes. The program moved from an initial focus on self, to a focus on helping one another as learners, to a focus on working with others as clients.

These features were continued and strengthened during the 1967 continued program:

1. Learning about self as an instrument for change (with a clearer perception of self; awareness of own motivations, needs, and values; the capacity to see gaps between own intentions and behavior, and the insight and skill to close the gap).

2. Structured work on designing and practicing a variety of leadership development approaches, using simulation, training one another, consulting.

3. Learning projects related to needs of the individual and his system, making use of library, of staff as consultants, of other trainees.

4. Designed use of the NTL child-youth-parent program at Bethel.

5. Reflection on planning interventions, managing innovations, documenting programs, evaluating.

6. Reality practice opportunities -- e.g. consultation with school system teams of different types, designing and conducting a short laboratory for teachers, designing and conducting two - three days of the Bethel laboratory for educators.

7. For the Interns -- "field placement" experience for the final two weeks of the summer program (last summer this was a one-week program for teachers and principals in Washington, D.C. This summer it was co-training experience with a senior trainer at Bethel).

Core Experience

We are working to define the "core experience." It may be described as follows:

The need to know about theories of:	The need for personal experiences as learner	The need for experience as trainers and/or consultants
Individual behavior	Giving and receiving feedback	Acting as group trainer or consultant in practice session
Interpersonal behavior	Relating to others	Designing and running skill practice sessions
Group behavior	Earning membership and leadership in groups	Presenting theory sessions
Social systems	Participating in inter-group situations	Entering another system as consultant
Linkage	Experiencing change interventions as subject	Designing research
Changing	Creating own theory	Evaluating activities
Learning	Participating in skill practice sessions	Documenting activities
Intervening	Discovering own potential (stretching experiences)	Acting as co-trainer
Values	Experiencing value dilemmas	
	Being subject of research	

Program included the following three phases:

PHASE I. Intensive 5-week residential experience at Bethel, Maine
The Interns spent four weeks at Bethel working on the above curriculum. The fifth week was spent conducting a training laboratory on interpersonal competence and problem-solving skills for a group of Washington, D.C. teachers. The Interns worked in pairs as co-trainers with each three pairs having a senior staff person as consultant (Matthew Miles, James Clark, and Cy Mill).

The Training Consultants spent five weeks at Bethel -- two weeks as participants in the Community Leadership Training Laboratory and three in an intensive program to develop their skill and knowledge as change agents and skills trainers in school systems.

Both programs built on the Lewinian definition of action research with concern on the one hand for the general laws of group life which guide the achievement of certain objectives under certain conditions, and on the other hand concern for the diagnosis of the particular situation.

Problem solving groups, sensitivity training groups, and the training community provided opportunities in realistic contexts to experiment with data collection on action, with diagnosis through the use of force field analysis and other means, with ways to feed back data to be used in planning, and with the designing and practice of ways to collect evaluative data.

Responsibility for designing their own learning program motivated the trainees to gather diagnostic data concerning their own needs and evaluation data concerning program activities. A voluntary action-research committee had responsibility for developing means of acquiring data and inventing feedback mechanisms and designs.

The staff for Bethel included Ronald Lippitt (University of Michigan), Dorothy Mial and Cy Mill (NTL), Eva Schindler-Rainman (California, Charles Jung (University of Michigan), Elmer Van Egmond (Lesley College), Richard Albertson (Washington State Education Association), James Clark (UCLA), and Matthew Miles (Teachers College).

PHASE II. Field Work. The objective here is to test and increase learning through practice. The procedure has been to help each trainee or geographic cluster to identify a senior staff member to serve as advisor or consultant and as link to other relevant members of the NTL Network. Instead of devoting funds to centralized staff functions, we allotted each trainee up to $900 out of grant funds to draw on in designing and carrying out projects to continue his own learning

as trainer and consultant on change programs. Sometimes a small investment in consultant help or for minimum expenses enabled the trainees to tap larger sums for projects. In some cases the availability of funds enabled trainees to initiate a project within their own system without actually drawing on the funds. The trainees had the task of submitting proposals describing the projects they wished to undertake with goals, budgets, methods, resources. (The Interim Report of December 19, 1966 spells this out further.)

PHASE III. Follow-up Training Week, May 1-5, 1967. The final phase was a one-week program to assess the year's work, provide opportunity to share Phase II field experiences, to influence the design of the program for 1967, and to continue training in design and practice sessions. The week was planned in March at a two-day meeting of the staff plus two Interns and two Training Consultants elected by the trainees. The design for the week revolved around:

1. Techniques of training
2. Development and maintenance of relationships
3. Strategies of change in educational systems
4. Role and relationship issues with NTL
5. Review of 1967 plans

EVALUATION

Objectives

Our objectives continue to be to provide the knowledge, theory, and experiences which seem to be required to meet multiple level training and consultation needs within educational systems. We see this as a key step in improvement efforts. We have now had a second summer to work on the program.

Results overall may be described in several ways:

1. An approach to training action researchers and trainers of action research collaborators has been tested. (Trainees and their senior sponsors have helped establish this ongoing program by recruiting trainees for the second year at their own or institutional expense.)

2. New or clarified roles have been invented and training designs initiated to be improved through further experimentation and development (e.g. the training consultant inside the school system, the cross-system task force for change).

3. New or clarified linkages between school-based change agents and university-based resources have been described and tested in practice.

4. It has been found possible to mobilize a national network of behavioral scientists to help in the continuing development of the trainees.

Content, etc.

The core experience with its emphasis on knowing, experiencing, and practicing continues to be the basis for the program. For the second summer we attempted to improve the design by allowing for more individualized learning focus with trainees using the library, the staff as consultant-informers, and one another as resources. We encouraged work on individual projects. For example, most of the Interns committed the last two weeks to a co-training experience with a senior trainer in the laboratories for educators. One, however, elected to commit this time to compiling a notebook of training designs developed during the summer to designs for work with social studies classes which he will pilot test. Another variation stemming out of last summer's evaluation called for more reality practice. This led us to bring to Bethel two groups seeking help on change programs. The Interns had realistic opportunity to gather data from the client system and to practice and observe consultant roles.

To the extent funds permit, we want to continue the supervised field work for interns and consultants. We found that with relatively small sums, the Interns could generate meaningful activities through which they could both serve school system needs and further their own learning. This is possible because we are able to mobilize the Fellows and Associates of NTL as consultants and supervisors. If funds do not permit us to carry out Phase II as we did last year, the trainees have indicated readiness to help defray the costs of such a program.

The spring training week was rated high by the trainees and the staff as an opportunity not simply to assess the experience and exchange information on Phase II projects but also to continue to work on the design and practice of training skills. However, we do not see this phase as crucial as the summer program and the field work. It would have been more crucial had the trainees not had contact with one another and with senior staff during the year.

Staff - ratio, assignments, etc.

A staff of four worked with the 22 Interns with three staff assigned to the 21 Training Consultants. This was a full-time assignment for the five-week program. During the second, or field work phase, twelve members of the NTL Network of social scientists worked with the Interns and Training Consultants for from one to ten days each over the school year. During the second summer (1967), a staff of four again worked with the 25 Interns with four also assigned to the 26 Training Consultants. This high ration of staff to trainees has been necessary to meet the wide range of training needs.

Trainees - Selection criteria, etc.

We have been able to continue the training program with fifty new trainees during the summer of 1967 and thus to test further our hypothesis that when individuals are trained as members of teams or task forces from the same system to play different roles in the system, they will have more impact, i.e., more effective in planning and in coping with resistance to change in the system than when the same number of persons are trained in isolation from colleagues. A development of the second year of the training program has been to recruit more aggressively teams who would be trained through concurrent programs with different levels of intensity (the two-week program for administrators, supervisors, teachers; the five-week program for school-based training consultants -- inside change agents with in-service training responsibilities; and the six - eight week program for university-based trainers able to design and conduct training laboratories including sensitivity training for interpersonal competence as well as training in problem-solving skills.

We propose to continue recruiting teams and to work on guidelines for team composition. We also propose recruiting trainees in geographic clusters so that it will be feasible to provide follow-up training and to encourage the trainees to support one another's efforts to continue their own development.

Organization, timing, length, schedule, etc.

On the basis of experience the first year, we extended the 1967 Phase I program from five to six weeks for the Interns with an added two-week basic human relations laboratory for those with no previous laboratory training. A second change was to build the final practice experience into the Bethel program with the Interns co-training with senior trainers in the laboratories for educators. This was felt to be more useful than having the Interns co-train at this stage in another setting. For the training consultant group we continued the schedule set in 1966 -- two weeks as participants in the Community Leadership Training Laboratory and three weeks of training designed around their needs as change agents and skill trainers in school systems. We again had them work for two days as consultants to participants in the Educators Laboratory at Bethel.

Typically, the day's schedule ran from 9:00 a.m. to 3:30 p.m. and from 7:30 to 9:30 p.m. Major time blocks were committed to problem analysis groups, skill training groups, theory presentations and discussions, time for reflection, time for consultation with staff and with other trainees, and time for work on process problems in any of these work situations. A major difference between a laboratory for participants and one for Interns is that the latter focuses both on membership and individual learning problems and on trainership and

design problems. In future designs we plan to put greater emphasis on theory and practice in designing.

Budget

The second summer has demonstrated that we can continue the program with relatively little outside support. Except for partial tuition scholarships to some of the trainees (made possible through carry-over funds from the Ford Foundation grant), the 1967 program was supported by individuals or their institutions. The cost for each trainee for fees and living expenses was set for 1967 at $1425 for six weeks, $1200 for five weeks.

MAJOR STRENGTHS OR UNIQUE FEATURES

The major strengths have included the mix of training with realistic practice, the development of an extended training design, and the emphasis on self direction by the Interns in designing their own learning activities. During the second year, greater emphasis has been placed on a three-phase sequence in trainee and trainer roles. We saw the first phase as being largely directed by the staff, the second phase as a collaborative undertaking, and the third phase as moving toward full self direction.

One of the major learnings has been that it is feasible to provide multiple level training for appropriate skill development in schools. Schools today are of necessity in the business of managing change. This requires a wide range of skill -- in problem solving, in taking action, in evaluating, in re-planning, in getting and using information at each stage, in working with people effectively. To meet these varied needs for competency requires a community of trainers -- a network of persons with complementary resources. The concept of multiple-level training skills starts with children who are not only positively motivated to learn but to help others to learn. It includes teachers who have problem-solving skills and the motivation and skill to give and receive help from others. It includes skilled trainers able to work with other teachers on classroom practices and with administrators who can provide necessary support for innovative teachers. It includes trainers from outside the system who can train persons within the system when training needs are beyond the competence of the inside trainer.

Another important learning has been that it is possible to mobilize social scientists and educators across the country to work as consultants to the trainees on their continuing learning needs.

MAJOR WEAKNESSES OR DIFFICULTIES

Our only problems with USOE have been that our proposal was approved very late in the year which handicapped us in recruitment and the fact that we were not re-funded for a second year. This

second problem was less acute than it might have been thanks to carry-over funds from the Ford grant. Help from the NTL Network and from our own alumni enabled us to recruit well qualified trainees despite the lateness of funding. Both in 1966 and in 1967 we were fortunate in having trainees of a high calibre. In future Intern Programs, however, we will probably insist upon more uniform academic background in the behavioral sciences with the probability of defining the program as post-doctoral (or near doctoral). This would continue to permit a wide range of trainees in the Training Consultant Program where sensitivity training skills are not among the objectives.

OVERALL EVALUATION

We have several sources of data. First, are the reports from senior staff members at the COPED centers which recruited about half of the trainees. Their consistent report is that the trainees returned and quickly assumed a new level of "colleagueship." The trainees are being utilized in COPED programs in professional training and consultant roles for which they were not seen as prepared previously.

The second source is the response of the trainees to the opportunity to initiate projects to apply and test what they learned. Projects undertaken and reported reflect continuing growth. In addition, we have over the past year given other training assignments to most of the Interns. The senior staff members with whom they have worked have in almost every instance reported favorably on the Intern's competence.

(NOTE: A review of some of the Phase II projects is included in the December 19, 1966 Progress Report. The trainees' and staff evaluations of Phase I are reported in the November 23, 1966 Interim Report. In both instances, trainees indicate that to a considerable degree their own objectives are being met. It is important to note that the training is seen as a continuing process which the summer activities initiated.)

A quotation from the report from one of the Interns, Rodney Napier of Temple University School of Education, reflects the significance of the field work in the training program:

> "The opportunity to take part in an intensive intern program of this nature is indeed rare. Not only did the training program provide the opportunity for immediate application of newly learned skills, but the 'Intern Year' provided a series of supervised training experiences not normally available. The allocation of project funds for the independent research and design building under the closest professional supervision provided a great amount of independence and flexibility while insuring much needed use of resource personnel. I doubt if I have ever had a more rewarding year of education."

RECOMMENDATIONS TO USOE

My major recommendation would be that grants be for a longer period than one year, that minimum energy be expended on renewal processes, and that notifications be as early as possible.

PROGRAM REPORT

Publicity

Notification of approval of the project came in the very late spring so that recruitment of necessity was by preliminary descriptions of the possible program and by individual letters sent to members of the NTL Network, to deans and professors of education, and to other individuals. Attention has been called to the program and to the role of the Research-Training Branch of the U.S. Office of Education largely through subsequent conferences (e.g. AERA, ASSA, Ortho-psychiatric Association).

Application Summary

1. Approximate number of inquiries from prospective trainees (letter or conversation)	65
2. Number of completed applications received	50
3. Number of first-rank applications (applicants who are well-qualified whether or not they were offered admission)	48
4. How many applicants were offered admission	43

Trainee Summary

1. Number of trainees initially accepted in program	43
Number of trainees enrolled at the beginning of program	43
Number of trainees who completed program	43
2. Categorization of trainees	
(a) Number of trainees who principally are elementary or secondary public school teachers	5
(b) Number of trainees who are principally local public school administrators or supervisors	13

(c) Number of trainees from colleges or universities, junior colleges, research bureaus, etc.

College or University	15	Education Assoc.	4
Research Bureaus	2	Commercial Organizations	2
State Office of Education	2		

Program Director's Attendance

1. What was the number of instructional days for the program? 45

2. What was the percent of days the director was present? (All but the decentralized field work) 70%

Financial Summary

1		Budgeted	Expended or Committed
1.	Trainee Support		
	(a) Stipends	$ 9,000	$ 9,000
	(b) Dependency Allowance	2,700	2,700
	(c) Travel	4,000	4,000
2.	Direct Costs		
	(a) Personnel	19,908	19,908
	(b) Supplies	500	500
	(c) Equipment	--	--
	(d) Travel	7,120	7,120
	(e) Indirect Costs	3,458	3,458
		$46,686	$46,686

National Education Association
1201 - 16th Street, Northwest, Washington, D.C. 20036

NATIONAL TRAINING LABORATORIES | (202) 234-4848

June 12, 1967

MEMORANDUM TO: Education Interns

FROM: Dorothy Mial for the Staff

RE: Summer Plans

It has occurred to me that a good way to inform you about plans for the program this summer is simply to share with you the inclosed review of the recent planning session of the staff. The staff will include:

Ron Lippitt, Dean (University of Michigan)

Gordon Hearn (Portland State College)

Mark Chesler (University of Michigan)

Kenneth Benne (Boston University - for part of the time)

Dorothy Mial (NTL)

National Education Association
1201 - 16th Street, Northwest, Washington, D.C. 20036

NATIONAL TRAINING LABORATORIES | (202) 234-4848

June 12, 1967

MEMORANDUM TO: Education Interns

FROM: Dorothy Mial

RE: Review of Planning Session

Concept around which we will design the program

The Education Intern Program is a Trainer of Trainers program focused on the professional growth needs of the interns. The interns will have to wear at least three hats: The individual experiencing (aiming at self-awareness, sensitivity to others, interpersonal competence), the group member leader helping to build group and community, and the professional trying to make sense of what is happening as it relates to his role as trainer, consultant, action researcher. For example, we will look at our experience in attempting to create learning groups and a community in order to understand groups and communities both as involved individuals and as professional trainers.

This concept has a number of implications for design and for roles of interns and of staff.

1. T-Groups

We start with the assumption that the interns will have had previous T-Group experience. The T-Groups will be used as facilitating experiences to help understand the trainer development experiences and to help diagnose each trainer's own professional growth needs. The staff see themselves not as trainers but as consultants to the interns as they practice and rotate trainer roles. The staff will be available on call for observing and clinicing and will also feel free to drop in without being called in.

2. Building of theory

We start with the notion that staff resources should be used but that interns should have the experience of building their own theory and philosophy of training and consultation. We see several implications in this for design:

a. The total program is an opportunity for weaving together relevant theory related to such concerns as:

Laboratory beginnings

Entry problems generally
The helping or consultant role
Temporary systems
Trainer styles - differences and consequences
Theory of training interventions
Integration of individual, group, organizational and community theory
Socialization processes
Research utilization
Power, authority, influence
Conflict management
Change and changing
Transfer of learning from training situation to back home behavior
Evaluation

b. Interns should experience theory building - use of library, of time alone, of staff utilization, of one another, of other available resources in Bethel, etc.

c. The program as a whole is an experience from which to derive theory. Regular pre-agreed on "stop times" are suggested as a way to build in efforts to try to understand the meaning of what is happening.

d. Also periodic data collection and feed back as a way to launch theory building.

e. Interns will have opportunity to develop and present theory themselves.

3. Individual learning time and project time for work on back home problems.

Interns should define their individual learning needs and there should be built in time to work alone or in project teams tapping available resources.

By the same token staff will not only need time to work as a staff but also will have one day a week for individual work when interns are working on their own.

4. Work on role sensitivity

In a professional growth program we see need to work on here and now phenomena coming out of analysis of back home situation, the multiple pressures inherent in it, and the adequacy or inadequacy of defenses built for coping.

5. Reality practice

We will emphasize interns helping one another on real problems but this alone is not adequate for reality practice. We see the following possibilities for this:

a. Consultation with school people who will be attending Bethel Labs (provided this can be worked into their laboratory schedule). There will be, for example, three training consultants from COPED-Trenton during the Community Lab as a potential client. The Superintendent from Athens, Ohio, will also be a training consultant and an Athens team will be at the Education Lab the last session.

b. Possibly, consultation with the new Bethel High School and the Gould Academy personnel regarding "start up" problems. This would have to be worked out early in July in Bethel.

c. Possibly, an event with the family groups in conjunction with the Children Youths Family Laboratory, Session II.

d. Associate training experience with Education Lab and other programs scheduled for the last two weeks. This will not take care of all the education interns. Some of them will have their co-training experience elsewhere, including the Methodist Labs and Michigan Labs.

e. Two day consultation, July 24-25, with leadership and staff team from Council for Exceptional Children. NTL has a contract to do a pilot lab next fall for teams made up of parent, physicians, teachers, counselors, community agency people, therapists - the adults, relating to children with cerebral palsy. The pilot program may lead to a series of regional programs. The pilot effort is funded by the United Cerebral Palsy Foundation and administered by the Council. The project team (if this consultation can be worked out), would be five to eight people representing Council Staff, Executive Committee, Division Staffs and the Foundation. Consultation would focus on the proposed pilot project and its spread but also on the Council's organizational change problems and potentials.

f. Two day consultation (tentative) on leadership development problems and opportunities of NEA field operations.

6. Productive work

We propose that interns have opportunity to actually produce training support materials, e.g. taped value confrontations, data collection instruments, interview guides, etc. The products might contribute to NTL's efforts in this area and/or could be useful take home items for the interns.

7. Basic library for trainers

Another kind of product is to start the development of a library of theory and training exercises for trainers. The interns would engage in an initial search of the library at Bethel and of trainers' brief cases and interns' brief cases (what do trainers single out as important and likely to be helpful when they come to labs?) We visualize boxing theory abstracts and training exercises and punching cards for each item.

We will have xerox for reproducing items interns want to keep (within reason or at nominal charge to cover cost).

This may represent a good test of the feasibility and desirability of a larger project on trainer materials.

8. Another potential reality practice

It may prove mutually desirable to design an activity jointly with the training consultants who will be engaged in a concurrent program. These two programs have the same basic concern. The education interns, however, are primarily persons located at universities with considerable behavioral science background and interested in working in consultant and trainer roles with educational systems. The training consultants are persons with in service training responsibilities and with potential or actual roles as change agents within educational systems. Included are principals, central office staff, supervisors, association field staff, etc.

9. Evaluation

There will be three major sources for evaluating the interns. The major source is the interns themselves - both self evaluation and evaluation of one another in terms of strengths and continuing needs for learning. The training staff is a second major source. The person with whom each intern will do co-training during the last phase of the summer program will be the third source. It would be the joint responsibility of staff and interns to work out the best placement or assignments for the last phase.

10. Pre-orientation

I am sending to the interns the attached excerpt from the progress report to the U. S. Office of Education and the Ford Foundation describing last summer's program and also a copy of This Is NTL.

Next Planning Session for the staff: 10:00 a.m., Friday, July 30th, in Bethel

The opening sessions for the interns: 7:30 p.m., Sunday, July 2nd

M E M O R A N D U M

Report of Planning Conference for Training Consultant Program to be held at Bethel this summer.

To: Dorothy Mial, Charles Hosford, Chick Jung, Dick Albertson

From: Elmer Van Egmond

Re: Preliminary Planning Conference, Training Consultant Program, Washington, D. C., March 22-25.

The following general assumptions guided our thinking about the design of the program:

1. Participants in the training consultant program will need some time early in the first week to develop cohesion and group identity.

2. To implement later work, they will need an opportunity to obtain an appreciation for the training consultant role.

3. Throughout the program, process issues will be a continuing concern as we work on tasks, skill development and other learning points.

4. The various training methods, design issues, and material used in the training program will be the subject of discussion and feedback from participants.

The following is a time block description of the design:

Monday Morning--begin with a brief orientation to the training consultant program. A series of vignettes will then be used to illustrate the kind of request which comes to a training consultant. The group will then be asked, "What would you do now?" Example: A training consultant receives a phone call from a building principal requesting help to improve his staff meetings; or a training consultant receives a request to help design an inservice training program for a school system staff. Participants would be asked to work in small groups, to think about the kinds of questions they would then ask for diagnostic purposes, the kinds of possible skills that would be needed in obtaining this information and beginning preliminary planning with the person making the request.

Monday Afternoon--attention would be given to the process by which the group worked together in the morning.

Monday Evening--T-group, followed by an opportunity for an informal social activity to facilitate acquaintance and group building.

Tuesday Morning--T-group, after coffee, an instrumented group to introduce various modes of focusing on process with structured procedures.

Tuesday Afternoon--T-group.

Tuesday Evening--the program would begin to focus specifically on needed skills for training consultant activity. Using a prepared set of materials which focus attention on relevant process and skill areas, participants would be asked to rate themselves on a series of dimensions, then share these ratings with other participants. Following this, they would rerate themselves and designate areas that they now wish to work on during the program.

Wednesday Morning--T-group focusing on areas of skill and process improvement. Over coffee, participants would be paired to focus on help which was and was not given. After coffee, T-group session focusing on those aspects of the group's work which were helpful to individuals and areas in which individuals did not receive help.

Wednesday Afternoon--final T-group session.

Wednesday Evening--free evening.

Thursday Morning--a short orientation to Phase II of the training consultant program. (Diagnosis, planning and training of peers.) Identify common learning needs, then compose groups to reflect similar interests. The balance of the morning will be spent in these groupings, planning for data collection from one other group.

Thursday Afternoon--groups will spend their time obtaining needed data from the other group toward planning a training activity to meet their learning needs.

Thursday Evening--theory input on force-field analysis as a diagnostic procedure. Following this, participants will complete a force field analysis of the group they will train, including process dimensions of the work done during the previous part of the day. In the light of force-field information, they will plan additional data collection as might be indicated.

Friday Morning--obtain additional data and give data to the other group. The second part of the morning will be spent completing planning and reworking the force field that has previously been created.

Friday Afternoon--groups will have an opportunity to use the library facilities and other resources to begin designing training activities for the group that they intend to train.

Monday Morning--groups will have an opportunity to complete their design.

Monday Afternoon and Evening--training activities.

Tuesday Morning--complete training activities.

During the periods of activity in which designing and conducting training activities are taking place, attention will be focused on the process of the group's work. Training activities will be critiqued by the group and redesigned if that seems indicated.

Time periods from the completion of the training activities through Friday evening will be spent in a series of simulation activities. The specific activities are represented in the design for the classroom teachers' workshop which will provide an opportunity to try out and de-bug the sequence. During this period of time it will also be necessary to work out relationships with the education lab to plan for diagnostic data gathering from that population.

Training activities during the third week will focus on designing training activities for groups in the education lab, presenting these activities, and critiquing the training program. The last part of the third week will be devoted to additional training and working with participants in planning the training programs and activities they will undertake when they return home.

Application For

1966 NTL EDUCATION INTERN PROGRAM
Bethel, Maine July 3 - August 5

This is a five-week program designed for persons with a background in the behavioral sciences and with previous laboratory training experience who have inservice training responsibilities in universities, school systems, state departments of education, or education associations. (Persons without previous laboratory experience could qualify by attending the June 13 - 25 laboratory at Bethel or comparable program prior to July 3.)

Personal Data

1. Mr.
   Miss
   Mrs. _____

2. Title or position (please describe) _____

   _____

3. Name of institution _____

   _____

4. Present or projected responsibilities related to inservice training: (Please describe briefly.)

5. Office address _____

   _____

6. Office telephone _____

7. Residence address _____

   _____

8. Residence telephone _____

9. Age _____ 10. Sex _____

Academic Background:

Degrees held: _____

Major field: _____

When received: _____

Institutes or additional professional training: _____

_____

_____

Amount of Behavioral Science Background: _____

_____

_____

Laboratory Session(s) Attended:

Where and when: _____

_____

Trainers: _____

_____

If you have not attended a previous laboratory, will you do so prior to July 3? Yes _____ No _____ (An NTL Laboratory is scheduled at Bethel, Maine June 13-24.)

Amount and Nature of Training Experience: _____

_____

_____

Nature of Commitment in your institution to inservice training and to innovations you may want to introduce:

[redacted]

Recommenders:

This application should be supported by at least two letters of reccommendation from persons (preferably NTL Fellows or Associates) associated with NTL's laboratory programs. Applicants are responsible for insuring that letters of recommendation are received by NTL by March 1, 1966.

Name _____

Name _____

Name _____

Mail this application form to:

Mrs. Dorothy Mial
Program Director for Education
National Training Laboratories
1201 Sixteenth Street, N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20036

ROSTER OF EDUCATION INTERNS

BARBER, William H.
Dean, School of Education
Gonzaga University
East 502 Boone Avenue
Spokane, Washington 99202

BARR, Donald J.
Assistant Professor
University of Michigan
School of Education
Ann Arbor, Michigan

BEACH, Norton L.
Dean
School of Education
University of North Carolina
Chapel Hill, North Carolina

CASPER, Irene G.
Assistant Professor of Education
Lesley College
29 Everett Street
Cambridge, Massachusetts

CERNIUS, Vytas
Associate Professor of Education
of Psychology
School Psychologist and Director of
Student Personnel Services in the
Laboratory School
Indiana State University
Terre Haute, Indiana

CHASNOFF, Robert E.
Professor
Newark State College
Union, New Jersey 07083

CLARK, Frances C. (Mrs.)
Elementary Teacher
Balboa School
Glendale Unified School District
411 E. Wilson
Glendale, California

* CLARK, James
Division Chairman of Behavioral
Sciences
Graduate School of Business
Administration
University of California
Los Angeles, California 90024

CROFT, John C.
Assistant Professor of Education
CASEA
Hendricks Hall
University of Oregon
Eugene, Oregon 97403

DAW, Robert W.
Assistant Superintendent
Santa Maria High School District
619 South Broadway
Santa Maria, California

ELLIS, Betty
Assistant Professor of Education
2236 N.W. Seventh Lane
Gainesville, Florida

HADLOCK, Alton P.
Director of Adult Education
University of Utah
Box 200
Salt Lake City, Utah

HARRY, Sue
Associate Professor of Education
University of Utah
Salt Lake City, Utah

KELLY, Shaun, Jr.
Associate Professor
Ferkauf Graduate School of
Humanities and Social Sciences
Yeshiva University
55 Fifth Avenue
New York, New York

* LIPPITT, Ronald
Professor of Sociology & Psychology
Center for Research on Utilization
of Scientific Knowledge
The University of Michigan
P. O. Box 1248
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48107

* LUKE, Robert, Jr.
Research Assistant
National Training Laboratories, NEA
1201 Sixteenth Street, N.W.
Washington, D. C., 20036

MANNO, Avis (Mrs.)
151 East 90 Street
New York, New York 10028

McCALL, Jeanne B. (Mrs.)
Supervisor
Diagnostic and Psychological Services
Office Superintendent of Public Instruction
State of Illinois
316 South Second Street
Springfield, Illinois

McELVANEY, Charles T.
Supervisor of Special Education
Allegheny County Schools
345 County Office Building
Pittsburgh 19, Pennsylvania

* MIAL, Dorothy J.
Program Director for Education
National Training Laboratories, NEA
1201 Sixteenth Street, N.W.
Washington, D. C. 20036

* MILES, Matthew B.
Professor of Education
Teachers College
Columbia University
Box 120
New York, New York 10027

* MILL, Cyril R.
Program Director for Consultation
National Training Laboratories, NEA
1201 Sixteenth Street, N.W.
Washington, D. C. 20036

MILLER, George L.
Director of Teacher Education
Lesley College
29 Everett Street
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138

NAPIER, Rodney Williamson
Assistant Professor of Educational Psychology
Temple University, Ritter Hall
Broad and Montgomery
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

NOVOTNEY, Jerrold M.
Assistant Director
IDEA - Institute for Development of Educational Activities
Suite 950 - 1100 Glendon Avenue
Los Angeles, California 90024

* SCHINDLER-RAINMAN, Eva
Community Organization Consultant
4267 San Rafael Avenue
Los Angeles, California 90024

SHAEVITZ, Morton H.
Assistant Professor
University of Michigan
1007 E. Huron
Ann Arbor, Michigan

SIMON, Anita
Assistant Professor
Temple University
Ritter Hall 234
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

YOUNG, Milton A.
Consultant, Planning Educational Innovations
State Department of Education
Room 360 - State Office Building
Hartford, Connecticut

ROSTER OF TRAINING CONSULTANTS

*Albertson, D. Richard
Director of Training Programs
Washington Education Association
910 Fifth Avenue
Seattle, Washington 98104

Ashcraft, Carolyn
Research Associate
Child Study Center, Box 158
George Peabody College
Nashville, Tennessee

Burke, George W., Jr.
Teacher; Exec. Committee
Quincy Teachers Association
15 Coddington St.
Quincy, Mass. 02069

Craib, Stephanie H.
Resource Teacher
South Brunswick Board of Ed.
Allston Road
Kendall Park, New Jersey 08824

Cureton, Laurence
Senior Lecturer in Education
Bishop Otter College
Chichester, Sussex, England

Graham, Hiram H.
Field Rep., Urban Services
National Education Association
1201 16th St. NW
Washington, D.C. 20036

Green, George
Urban Representative
NEA West Coast Office
1705 Murchison Drive
Burlingame, California 94010

Jerrems, Raymond L.
Principal, Raymond El. School
3663 S. Wabash
Chicago, Ill. 60653

*Jung, Charles C.
Project Director, CRU SK
Institute for Social Research
University of Michigan - Box 1248
Ann Arbor, Michigan

LeBaron, Walter A.
Washington Intern in Education
National Education Association
1201 16th St., NW
Washington, D.C. 20036

Lovetere, John P.
Principal, Old Orchard Junior High
9360 North Kenton
Skokie, Ill. 60077

McDermott, William R.
Teacher, Heatherly School
Ann Vinal Road
Scituate, Mass. 02066

Moulton, Gerald L.
Associate Professor of Education
Central Washington State College
Ellensburg, Washington 98926

Murray, Donald J.
Director of Field Services
Washington Education Association
910 Fifth Avenue
Seattle, Washington 98104

Murray, J. Erica
Christian Education Worker
Episcopal Church
270 Porter Street
Melrose, Mass. 02176 (COPED staff)

Otto, James G.
El. Principal, Hoover E. School
Livonia Public Schools
15900 Levan Road
Livonia, Michigan 48154

Palmer, A.M. Barney
Minn. Ed. Assn. Staff
41 Sherburne St.
St. Paul, Minnesota

Parkllan, Arthur G.
COPED Project Director
Detroit Public Schools
5057 Woodward Ave.
Detroit, Michigan 48202

* Staff

Slawik, George
Principal
Jane Stenson School
Skokie District 68
9201 Lockwood Ave.
Skokie, Ill. 60077

Soule, J ohn C.
Principal
Franklin School
1333 Pine
Detroit, Mich.

Spiegel, Jerry
Director of Staff Training and
Development
Chicago Youth Commission
285 North Wabash Ave.
Chicago, Ill.

Tancil, Sallie
Supervisor
Model School Division
Washington Schools
Washington, D.C.

Thompson, Howard E.
Curriculum Specialist
510 Winthrop St.
Jackson, Michiga n 49201

*Van Egmond, Elmer E.
Dean of General Education
Lesley College
29 Everett St.
Cambridge, Mass. 02138

* Staff